IT is reinforcing its commitment to the support of academics, students, faculty and administrators.

Prepared by Dick Thompson, CIO (dick.thompson@maine.edu • 973-3224)
Update on the Administrative Review of IT

- What it is expected to achieve
  - Quality services meeting or exceeding needs
  - Redundancy/overlap only where necessary
  - Flexibility and innovation at the campus level but managed to common standards
  - Transparent IT research and development process for new tools/applications
  - Cost savings/efficiencies

- What it is not
  - A preconceived outcome
  - “Us” versus “Them”
  - One size fits all

- The scope of the review
  - Analyze management structure and senior staffing model
  - Evaluate potentially redundant services
    - Customer Support Services
    - Telecommunications/network/wireless management
    - Individual campus datacenters
    - Procurement/Acquisition processes
    - Video Conferencing
    - Learning Management/Classroom Tech Tools
    - Web Services
    - Device/Computer lab provisioning (BYOD)
  - Evaluate systems/applications/assigned resources
  - Enterprise system strategy
  - Develop an initiative management process for R/D of new products/services
  - Consider a single operating budget
    - Inventory staff and infrastructure
    - Review and streamline funding model
  - Establish/implement policies and standards for architecture, hardware, software
• **IT Review process**
  ◦ Teams formed to evaluate major functions
    • End User Technology Strategy
    • Customer Support Service delivery
    • Unified Communications – voice, data, video
    • Standards and Procurement
  ◦ IT leaders, CIO and other contributors conducting
    • Budget/Expense data collection and analysis
    • Policy and practice analysis
    • Management and decision making structures

• **Early Findings**
  ◦ Data and Information
    • Inventory of staff (225+) and expenditures ($31 million +) across UMS
    • Data is not maintained in a manner to evaluate specific service component costs
    • Inventory of assets, hard and soft, are not common or easy to access
  ◦ Provision of IT services
    • Individual campuses have expertise within certain service offerings that can be shared
    • Local service provision is given high priority
    • Some standard services exist, suggesting expansion of shared services
    • Services are uniquely designed in most cases, lack of commonality
  ◦ Other high level findings
    • Standards for IT hard and soft infrastructure, vendor management, products and common practices needed
    • Need for service catalog and common delivery strategy for most common services
    • System Wide Services IT is perceived as one size fits all, inflexible, slow to respond
    • Flexibility is coveted
    • Policies and practices needed to guide decision making
    • Decision making is distributed, consensus requires 100% agreement

• **Next Steps**
  ◦ Develop recommendations to create efficiency, service improvements and cost savings
    • Policies and practices to guide work
    • Strategies to improve service delivery in the areas investigated
    • Process to provide regular review of IT services and new requests
    • Leadership structure to foster collaboration and consolidation where appropriate
    • Expand IT commitment in support of academics, students and faculty
  ◦ Solicit input and communicate the conclusions in early December
  ◦ Complete the report and submit to Chancellor on December 31, 2012
# Statistics at a Glance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UMS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dept)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>194.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$14,165,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-dept)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$2,346,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom</td>
<td>$1,471,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual</td>
<td>$231,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Tech</td>
<td>$57,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>$30,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>$4,448,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Services</td>
<td>$-17,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General IT</td>
<td>$3,453,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>-$2,143,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-IT Spend</td>
<td>$112,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$24,155,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on reported data only. Verification of data underway.  
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